

Date: Sat, 3 Jul 93 04:30:24 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #214
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sat, 3 Jul 93 Volume 93 : Issue 214

Today's Topics:

 NQ0I Case : HF Vertical Antennas (3 msgs)
 Repeater coordination, complaints? (2 msgs)
 Repeater Turkeys (3 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 1 Jul 93 14:45:47 GMT
From: att!att!bigtop!druwa!n2ic@princeton.edu
Subject: NQ0I Case : HF Vertical Antennas
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Date: Fri, 2 Jul 1993 18:38:52 GMT
From: pravda.sdsc.edu!news.cerf.net!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!
headwall.Stanford.EDU!Csli!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: NQ0I Case : HF Vertical Antennas
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In <C9HqCC.MrK@bigtop.dr.att.com> n2ic@druwa.att.com (NB7241000-
LondonSM(DR2305)224) writes:
>The real solution is for the FCC to modify PRB-1, so it's not so wishy-washy.

Having so stated, what modifications would you make to PRB-1?

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, _A Nation of Victims_

Date: Sat, 3 Jul 1993 04:59:12 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: NQ0I Case : HF Vertical Antennas
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

paulf@Csl.i.Stanford.EDU (Paul Flaherty) writes:

>In <C9HqCC.MrK@bigtop.dr.att.com> n2ic@druwa.att.com (NB7241000-
LondonSM(DR2305)224) writes:
>>The real solution is for the FCC to modify PRB-1, so it's not so wishy-washy.
>
>Having so stated, what modifications would you make to PRB-1?

I would suggest that for antenna restrictions below 60-75 feet, that the governing body would have to provide evidence that the restriction is necessary to ensuring the public health, welfare, and safety. As those are the normal functions of zoning laws, that restriction seems fairly reasonable. Restrictions based upon aesthetic bias would thus be eliminated.

Personally I'd rather it make even a stronger statement. If people want to live someplace that requires you mow your lawn on the diagonal and border plants can only be 18" tall, let them find such a place with CCR&Rs. But those sorts of things along with overly restrictive antenna zoning laws do not belong in public law. I thought freedom **was** one of the fundamental tenets of our government. Apparently I'm mistaken.

73,

Todd

N9MWB What would Thomas Jefferson think of our laws today?

Date: Fri, 2 Jul 93 21:25:57 GMT
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!jmaynard@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Repeater coordination, complaints?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

[This discussion really belongs in .policy; followups redirected.]

By and large, John's posting is on target...I feel compelled to correct one

factual error (if only in implication):

In article <w4hx86n@dixie.com> jgd@dixie.com (John De Armond) writes:
>No he didn't. He claimed the other machine was running the "legal
>limit". I'll be charitable and assume he knows what the legal limit is.
>It is obvious >>YOU<< don't. I'm still waiting for you who, in true ham
>fashion argue vociferously from a perspective of abject ignorance, to
>define the term. I *know* what the term means as applies to repeaters.
>But I'm going to let you try and discover the meaning for yourself.

I assume you're talking about the HAAT vs. ERP limits that were a part of
repeater rules for years. Those went away in the last rewrite; the FCC decided
that that issue could and should be left up to the coordinators, instead of
being cast in regulatory concrete.

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.
"If my car ran OS/2, it'd be there by now" -- bumper sticker

Date: Sat, 3 Jul 1993 00:42:18 GMT
From: psinntp!iat.holonet.net!bwilkins@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Repeater coordination, complaints?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

jmaynard@nyx.cs.du.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:
: [This discussion really belongs in .policy; followups redirected.]
:
: By and large, John's posting is on target...I feel compelled to correct one
: factual error (if only in implication):
:
: In article <w4hx86n@dixie.com> jgd@dixie.com (John De Armond) writes:
: >No he didn't. He claimed the other machine was running the "legal
: >limit". I'll be charitable and assume he knows what the legal limit is.
: >It is obvious >>YOU<< don't. I'm still waiting for you who, in true ham
: >fashion argue vociferously from a perspective of abject ignorance, to
: >define the term. I *know* what the term means as applies to repeaters.
: >But I'm going to let you try and discover the meaning for yourself.
:
: I assume you're talking about the HAAT vs. ERP limits that were a part of
: repeater rules for years. Those went away in the last rewrite; the FCC decided
: that that issue could and should be left up to the coordinators, instead of
: being cast in regulatory concrete.
: --

Jay how does your local coordinating group decide on the erp of a 2meter
repeater? Here we try to establish a one to one relationship between the

receiver and transmitter of the repeater using a typical 30 watt mobile. Alligators serve no useful purpose, they only frustrate the user group.

It is unclear as to what the poster is really saying. Is he a user of the system who is unaware of some past agreement between trustees of the system, or is this a new development? Quite often trustees of close spaced systems agree to operate that way, and new users don't have a clue.

We try to coordinate repeaters with the users' interests foremost. Seems to cause the least problems. Of course trustees can agree to almost anything. There are several channels that have two or three repeaters in the same area, just different PL tones. Works quite well as the users of these repeaters understand how it works, and want to make it work. We will see more of this non-competitive operation in the future.

--

Bob Wilkins n6fri voice 440.250+ 100pl san francisco bay area
bwilkins@holonet.net packet n6fri @ n6eeg.#nocal.ca.usa.na

Date: Fri, 2 Jul 1993 18:44:57 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!Csli!
paulf@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Repeater Turkeys
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In <C9IE74.JyB@feenix.metronet.com> marcbg@feenix.metronet.com (Marc Grant) writes:

>Here in the great Dallas Metroplex, we are having quite a few problems
>with repeater turkeys. It ranges from dead-keys, music, to digitized
>obscenity keychains (little boxes that are attached to keychains and have
>buttons to push which utter obscenities).

A remotely programmable PL decoder works wonders on these yahoos. Of course, if they buy one of the new autodecode HTs out there, you're sunk, but most aren't willing to fork out the change. It also doesn't take much additional hardware to change your PL tone on a daily or hourly basis.

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, _A Nation of Victims_

Date: Sat, 3 Jul 1993 01:19:48 GMT
From: psinntp!iat.holonet.net!bwilkins@uunet.uu.net

Subject: Repeater Turkeys
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

paulf@Csl.Stanford.EDU (Paul Flaherty) writes:

: In <C9IE74.JyB@feenix.metronet.com> marcbg@feenix.metronet.com (Marc Grant)
writes:

: >Here in the great Dallas Metroplex, we are having quite a few problems
: >with repeater turkeys. It ranges from dead-keys, music, to digitized
: >obscenity keychains (little boxes that are attached to keychains and have
: >buttons to push which utter obscenities).

:

: A remotely programmable PL decoder works wonders on these yahoos. Of course,
: if they buy one of the new autodecode HTs out there, you're sunk, but most
: aren't willing to fork out the change. It also doesn't take much additional
: hardware to change your PL tone on a daily or hourly basis.

:

Our repeater has several pl tones. We publish one of them, so the duo-band
and key chain etc. jammers can have fun. We are really monitoring or
decoding a different tone and are not bothered by their activity even
though it is being repeated. It is only when they get a reaction that they
stick around. Why is it with 50 or more repeaters in your area, yours
being hit? Some one must be reacting. Dont take it so seriously or it
could really become a problem. I have seen several good groups and their
repeaters broken up by their attitude.

--

Bob Wilkins n6fri voice 440.250+ 100pl san francisco bay area
bwilkins@holonet.net packet n6fri @ n6eeg.#nocal.ca.usa.na

Date: Sat, 3 Jul 1993 02:56:39 GMT
From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!hermes.chpc.utexas.edu!news.utdallas.edu!
feenix.metronet.com!marcbg@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Repeater Turkeys
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jul2.184457.5087@Csl.Stanford.EDU> paulf@Csl.Stanford.EDU (Paul
Flaherty) writes:

>In <C9IE74.JyB@feenix.metronet.com> marcbg@feenix.metronet.com (Marc Grant)
writes:

>>Here in the great Dallas Metroplex, we are having quite a few problems
>>with repeater turkeys. It ranges from dead-keys, music, to digitized
>>obscenity keychains (little boxes that are attached to keychains and have
>>buttons to push which utter obscenities).

>

>A remotely programmable PL decoder works wonders on these yahoos. Of course,
>if they buy one of the new autodecode HTs out there, you're sunk, but most
>aren't willing to fork out the change. It also doesn't take much additional
>hardware to change your PL tone on a daily or hourly basis.

Well, what are you supposed to do about the repeater users? If you have a
club with 500 members, should we call them up every hour with the new PL
Tone? If we change the PL tone on the fly, then honest users are stuck!

--

Marc B. Grant, N5MEI Internet: marcbg@feenix.metronet.com
P.O. Box 850472 Telephone: 214-231-3998 (voice)
Richardson, TX 75085-0472 214-231-0025 (fax)

Date: 2 Jul 1993 15:54:19 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!
news.bbn.com!bbn.com!levin@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <20t1b6INNbm1@west.West.Sun.COM>, <C9I0tx.DzA@news.iastate.edu>,
<1993Jul11.212945.29035@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>)
Subject : Re: Presence of control operator

whs70@dancer.cc.bellcore.com (sohl,william h) writes:

|As such, there's nothing wrong with my daughter (unlicensed) using
|my 2m HT to call "K2UNK monitoring" on our local repeater and holding
|a QSO with whoever answers AS LONG AS I AM RIGHT THERE as the control
|operator.

|At the field day site we set up, we invite non hams to operate in
|the presence of control operators all the time. Nothing wrong with that.

I think the only pitfall in this situation is that the non-licensed
individual is considered a third party, and in a QSO with a DX station
the third party rules apply.

/J KD10N

=

Nets: levin@bbn.com |
pots: (617)873-3463 |
KD10N (@KB4N.NH.USA) |

"I gotta go."
-- I. Shoales

Date: Fri, 2 Jul 1993 22:47:34 GMT

From: sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!news.dtc.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!hpuerca.atl.hp.com!jab@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jul1.231534.10843@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>, <w4hx86n@dixie.com>,
<1993Jul2.212557.6252@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>
Subject : Re: Repeater coordination, complaints?

In <1993Jul2.212557.6252@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu> jmaynard@nyx.cs.du.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:

stuff deleted....

>I assume you're talking about the HAAT vs. ERP limits that were a part of
>repeater rules for years. Those went away in the last rewrite; the FCC decided
>that that issue could and should be left up to the coordinators, instead of
>being cast in regulatory concrete.

So... at least in our area, (SERA) a significant change in ERP or HAAT or repeater location can be grounds for recoordination. Anything that changes the "footprint" of the rptr. (TX or RX, though only TX is ever an issue.)

So change to a beam, or up your power level, and you may be worse off than you are now. IE: you would have to be recoordinated. And down here, co-channel is 150 miles. Thus you could not make this change without loosing your coordination. This keeps a "neighbor" from up'ing his ERP and increasing his footprint while "shrinking" yours.

Now, depending on your coordination group, if the "legal limit" guy was previously running lower ERP, then the original poster may have a case. The Coord group could declare the "legal limit" guy as uncoordinated. This will not make the "legal limit" guy stop unless you can prove malicious (sp?) intent, and even then you will have a difficult time getting the FCC interested.

If you accepted the coord knowing that this rptr's TX footprint is in your coverage area, then there is not much you can do. You should have asked for another pair. I know sometimes you take what you can get. Better yet, move to 440 or 220.

I think SERA defines the change as either 1 or 3 DB for ERP. Notice that this can include moving to a higher gain antenna, lower loss feedline, etc. I have never seen this enforced without malicious intent being present.

Good Luck, (and try PL, it can work wonders!)

Alan Barrow km4ba | If a little knowledge.....
jab@atl.hp.com | is a dangerous thing.....
...!gatech!kd4nc!km4ba!alan | then what is the Anti-Dote???

Date: Fri, 2 Jul 1993 23:29:30 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!fc.hp.com!perry@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <Jun30.170300.50918@yuma.ACNS.ColoState.EDU>,
<C9HqCC.MrK@bigtop.dr.att.com>, <1993Jul2.183852.4804@Csl.Stanford.EDU>
Subject : Re: NQOI Case : HF Vertical Antennas

Paul Flaherty (paulf@Csl.Stanford.EDU) wrote:
: n2ic@druwa.att.com writes:
: >The real solution is for the FCC to modify PRB-1, so it's not so
: >wishy-washy.

: Having so stated, what modifications would you make to PRB-1?

How about minimum height requirements for each band? To be in the
public interest (e.g. during the SFO quake a few years back), this
should be adequate for reaching anywhere in the US from anywhere in the
US. Your mileage may vary.

Here's my straw man.

40m: 60'
20m: 30'
10m: 15'

Where did I pull these numbers from? Well, they're about 1/2 wavelength
high. You can choose to put a yagi at that height or use a 1/2 wave
vertical - either one makes a dandy antenna.

Perry Scott
AA0ET

Date: (null)
From: (null)
The NQOI decision came from the United States Court of Appeals - 10th District.

The only higher court is the United States Supreme Court.

The real solution is for the FCC to modify PRB-1, so it's not so wishy-washy.

Steve London, N2IC/0

Date: 2 Jul 93 17:05:37 GMT
From: walter!porthos!dancer!whs70@RUTGERS.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <C9I0tx.DzA@news.iastate.edu>,
<1993Jul11.212945.29035@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>, <m38mhbINNet5@news.bbn.com>ortho
Subject : Re: Presence of control operator

In article <m38mhbINNet5@news.bbn.com> levin@bbn.com (Joel B Levin) writes:
>whs70@dancer.cc.bellcore.com (sohl,william h) writes:
>|As such, there's nothing wrong with my daughter (unlicensed) using
>|my 2m HT to call "K2UNK monitoring" on our local repeater and holding
>|a QSO with whoever answers AS LONG AS I AM RIGHT THERE as the control
>|operator.
>
>|At the field day site we set up, we invite non hams to operate in
>|the presence of control operators all the time. Nothing wrong with that.
>
>I think the only pitfall in this situation is that the non-licensed
>individual is considered a third party, and in a QSO with a DX station
>the third party rules apply.
> /J KD10N

No argument with that, but since field day isn't a DX contest (all our
FD contacts were US or Canadian), I see no problem with the 3rd Party
rules.

Standard Disclaimer- Any opinions, etc. are mine and NOT my employer's.

Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)
Morristown, NJ email via UUCP bcr!cc!whs70
201-829-2879 Weekdays email via Internet whs70@cc.bellcore.com

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #214
